

REMARKS

Claims 11, 13-20 and 22-26 remain pending in this application with claims 11, 16 20, 24 and 25 being amended by this response.

Rejection of Claims 11, 13-20 and 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 11, 13-20 and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Collings (US Patent #5,828,402).

The present claimed invention recites a system for selectably controlling viewing and recording of television programs. The system includes at least one viewer profile establishing a set of limits for blocking images outside said limits from view. At least one limit is selected from the group including: program ratings, spending, channel, view time limits, time of day limits, image content ratings. The present invention also provides for at least one override list including at least one override instruction applicable to the included at least one viewer profile. A conflict resolver is provided for detecting the existence of a conflict between override instructions and automatically resolve conflicts between override instructions upon detecting the existence of a conflict. Independent claims 11, 16, 20, 24 and 25 include similar limitations directed to the conflict resolver. Independent Claims 11, 16 20, 24 and 25 each contain limitation similar to those described above.

The present invention is based on a “supervisor control system which permits the supervisor to enter ratings, spending, or view time limits and thereby block viewing of any program which exceeds those limits” (page 3, lines 7-8). Many supervisor control systems allow a user to “temporarily override such limits to permit specific programs to be viewed, to make a temporary change in the rating limit...and/or to temporarily revise a view time limit” (page 3, lines 9-11). The present invention allows the input of multiple overrides. Multiple overrides will at times conflict with each other. Therefore, there is a need for a system which is able to detect and resolve conflicts automatically as in the present claimed invention.

Collings describes a system and method for blocking the reception of television programming which meets specified criteria. The methods of Collings allow several different rating systems to be used simultaneously. The system includes a menu which “allows the features of apparatus 20 to be individually enabled or disabled. Each of the features listed beside options [1] to [6] of menu 90 can be set to ON, SLEEP (for a specified time period) or OFF...If SLEEP is selected the feature will be disabled for a period of time designated by the “Sleep Time”” (Column 17, lines 9-18). Additionally, “a **user** may simply disable one or more individual features from the list of menu choices” (Column 17, lines 22-23) (the menu choices being of menu 90).

Menu 90 of Figure 5B displays three options for each of the given categories available for limits. The three options are “Enabled”, “Off” and “Sleep”. The “Enabled” option displays the ability of the system to set limits on viewing capabilities. The “Off” and “Sleep” mode display the ability to disable the limits mentioned by suppressing them for a period of time or simply disabling (turning off) the limit altogether. Collings allows multiple disabling commands. However, Collings neither discloses nor suggests a system for “detecting the existence of a conflict between override instructions and **automatically** resolving conflicts between said override instructions upon detecting the existence of a conflict” as in the present claimed invention.

The Examiner contends that in the disclosure of a main menu 90 in which a user can individually enable or disable features of the apparatus Collings has met the limitations of a conflict resolver. The Examiner uses the broadest definition of the previous claim language to read that an individual whom is able to manually resolve conflicts can be labeled a conflict resolver. However, this resolution is done **manually**. This is unlike the present claimed invention which “detect[s] the existence of a conflict between override instructions and **automatically** resolving conflicts between said override instructions upon detecting the existence of a conflict”. The Office Action contends that conflicts will inherently exist between overrides. However, this situation is neither addressed by nor considered by Collings. Collings neither discloses nor

suggests “a conflict resolver for detecting the existence of a conflict between override instructions” as in the present claimed invention. Furthermore, Collings neither provides for nor suggests “**automatically** resolving conflicts between said override instructions upon detecting the existence of a conflict” as in the present claimed invention. In Collings, options are provided for allowing a user to manually enable or disable blocking options either immediately or at specified time (SLEEP option). The interpretation of this feature of Collings as a conflict resolver extends beyond any disclosure in Collings as Collings does not address the issue of conflicts between overrides. In view of this, Collings does not provide for “a conflict resolver for detecting the existence of a conflict between override instructions” as in the present claimed invention. Thus, Collings further neither discloses nor suggests “**automatically** resolving conflicts between said override instructions upon detecting the existence of a conflict” as in the present claimed invention.

In view of the above remarks it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in Collings showing the above discussed features. It is thus further respectfully submitted that claims 11, 16, 20, 24 and 25 are patentable over Collings. Since claims 13-15, 17-19, 22-23 and 26 are dependant on independent claims 11, 16, 20 and 25 respectfully, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 11, 16, 20 and 25. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

The applicant respectfully submits, in view of the above arguments, that the all arguments made by the Examiner have been addressed and this rejection should be withdrawn. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that the present claimed invention is patentable.

Application No. 09/475,447

Attorney Docket No. RCA 89,894

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
David Johnston Lynch

By: 

Jack Schwartz

Reg. No. 34,721

Tel. No. (609) 734-6866

Thomson Licensing Inc.
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
June 21, 2005



Application No. 09/475,447

Attorney Docket No. RCA 89,894

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING under 37 C.F.R. §1.8

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

Date: June 21, 2005

Linda Tindall
Linda Tindall